

Date Stamped Received by OAR Docket 9/28/98

NOTE TO AIR AND RADIATION DOCKET & INFORMATION CENTER (6102)

SUBJECT: Correction to Docket Number A-96-56, VI-C-01

Please find attached an errata sheet for the subject document. This correction was generated on Wednesday, September 23, 1998, prior to the time of submission. However, due to an administrative/clerical error, this correction was not transmitted with the original document, which was sent electronically to your office at 11:43 p.m., Thursday, September 24, 1998.

Please date stamp this correction the day of this electronic submission--September 28, 1998.

If you have any questions, please call me at 919/541-5565.

(signed)

David G. Cole  
Air Quality Strategies  
and Standards Division

## Errata

The following replaces an EPA response to comment from Union Camp, APCA, INGAA, etc. on page 263 of the response to comments document for the ozone transport rulemaking (NO<sub>x</sub> SIP Call) located in the Air and Radiation docket, Number A-96-56, VI-C-01:

**SUMMARY:** Several comments state that EPA's assessment of costs and cost-effectiveness for non-utility sources were inadequate, and provided specific engineering cost and control effectiveness data to assist EPA in the analysis of the final rule. **Union Camp (V-H-31); APCA (V-H-84); INGAA (V-H-157); DuPont (V-H-176); Capitol (V-I-01); Tenneco (V-I-17)**

**RESPONSE:** EPA reviewed all non-utility cost and cost-effectiveness data that was submitted. In three cases (Union Camp, Capitol, Tenneco), the cost data was not complete, and therefore EPA was not able to fully evaluate the merit of the submission. Examples of missing information include installed capital cost, annual operation and maintenance costs, boiler size and fuel type, equipment life, capital recovery factor, and control efficiency. In one case (APCA), EPA has rejected the comment in favor of the information provided in the Cement Manufacturing ACT document. EPA believes that the vigorous approach used in developing the ACT document provides more reliable cost and effectiveness information than that presented by the commenters. In another case (INGAA), the cost and cost-effectiveness data submitted are consistent with the data EPA has used from the Stationary Gas Turbine ACT document, so no adjustments to EPA's costs were deemed necessary. In another case (DuPont), the cost-effectiveness data submitted are consistent with the data EPA has used, so no adjustments to EPA's cost-effectiveness data were deemed necessary.